

Books of Moses - Fact or Fiction?

Land Animals, Humans and the Evolution of Life

In this session, we will first continue examining the Biblical Creation Week, focussing on Day Six, during which God creates all of the terrestrial land animals and the first humans. Then God gives the humans their jobs. After that, on Day Seven they all have a day of rest and celebration together.

From the secular beliefs model, we will look at the suggested routes that evolution took to get from an original 'simple' prokaryote cell to complex multicellular organisms like humans. Potential roadblocks in this route will be pointed out.

Special Creation:

Gen 1:24 Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth live souls, *each* after its kind: livestock and creeping things and its beasts of the earth, *each* after its kind." And it was so.

Gen 1:25 So God made the beasts of the earth after their kinds, livestock after their kinds, and everything that creeps on the earth after their kinds. And God saw that it was good.

So God explains that He begins the Sixth Day by making all of the terrestrial animals, including worms, insects, all kinds of wild beasts and even domestic livestock. Once again, God says these creatures all have souls, and He was pleased with them.

Next, God creates the first humans:

Gen 1:26 Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea, over the flying creatures of the heavens, and over the livestock, and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth."

Gen 1:27 So God created man in His image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

This passage introduces the last physical creations God (and His Son - John 1:1-17) made in forming and populating the earth. It also shows that God had a special commitment to these creatures: these humans are the only ones that He says are made "in Our image". He also states that He will create them to "rule over" all the earth and all the other creatures He has made. Finally, He states that we were created "male and female". Though the other animals were also male and female, this is the first time it is specifically mentioned.

In Genesis 2, we are given a more detailed explanation of the process God used in making the first man and woman:

Gen 2:7 And Jehovah God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living soul.

Gen 2:8 Jehovah God planted a Paradise in Eden to the East, and He put the man whom He had formed there.

Gen 2:9 And out of the earth Jehovah God *had* made every tree grow that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of Paradise and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

In forming the man, God confirms that the matter He used came from the earth. But Jehovah God also shows us that merely shaping the man, complete with all of the potential genetics and nanomachines required by life was not enough. The man was still just a corpse. It was only when God personally blew the breath of life into him that he became a living soul. There are other scriptures that confirm that God must add that 'breath of life' to every one of us before we

actually come alive.

1 Corinthians 2:11 explains that we must have this Spirit from God in order to know how to be human and to be able to function as a human. This means that each person is a triune being composed of a body, soul and spirit. When we die our first death, our spirit returns to God, and our body and soul return to the ground (Heb 4:12, 1 Thes 5:23, Ecc 12:6-7).

As we are made in the image of God, it should be no surprise to learn that the Bible teaches that God also has a body, soul and spirit (Dan 7:9, Lev 26:11, Gen 6:3). So He too is a triune being. This topic is explored in our article *Spirit, Soul and Body*.

We are only conscious, fully functioning beings when all three components are present and active. It seems probable that our brains are the interface between our body, soul and spirit. Thus damage to parts of our brain may make it difficult for our spirit to control the corresponding part of our body. However, there is new research confirming that our spirits have some ability to reallocate functions in our brain, sometimes allowing communication and function to be restored.

Ecclesiastes 3:21 shows that animals also have their own spirits, but their spirits are stored in the earth when they die. So they are also triune beings, but made on a different level to us.

By the way, it is sobering to know that on a mass to mass basis, rats, dolphins and elephants all have brain to body ratios as large as ours. Our status as their rulers depends on our appointment to this role by God, rather than on some imagined superiority we have of our own.

Gen 2:15 Then Jehovah God took the man and settled him in the Paradise of Pleasure to tend and keep it.

Gen 2:16 And Jehovah God commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree in Paradise you may freely eat;

Gen 2:17 "but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it, dying you shall die."

We see that God has taken the unusual step of placing the man in His special Paradise of Pleasure, also known as the Garden of Eden. And Jehovah God also gave the man his first job: tending and keeping Paradise. So man did not begin as a barbaric hunter and gatherer, but as a horticulturist working in a superb parkland and orchard.

He was also given specific instructions which will become of immense importance later.

But we still only have one man. Let's see where the first woman comes from:

Gen 2:18 And Jehovah God said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him."

Gen 2:19 Out of the earth Jehovah God *had* formed every beast of the field and every flying creature of heaven. He brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called each living soul, that was its name.

Gen 2:20 So Adam gave names to all cattle, to the flying creatures of the heavens, and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper comparable to him.

Gen 2:21 And Jehovah God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place.

Gen 2:22 Then the rib which Jehovah God had taken from the man He built into a woman, and He brought her to the man.

Gen 2:23 And Adam said: “This time, this one is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Woman, because this one was taken out of Man.”

So we have an interesting interlude here. God gives the man, now named Adam, the job of naming the various kinds of creatures that lived near the Garden. It seems likely that they came to him in male and female pairs for him to name. As Adam worked through his task, it appears that he eventually realizes that unlike all of these animals, he does not have a female partner.

So one can easily imagine the conversation between Adam and God, and God’s offer to make a partner for Adam from his body, which Adam accepts.

So we are told that God takes a rib from Adam and builds a woman. Note that God does not use a toe, so the woman would be under his foot, but uses a rib, as a rib is near Adam’s heart.

But also notice that God did not simply build a clone of Adam. The DNA in the bone was altered to make a woman. Verse 23 indicates Adam’s delight and satisfaction with the woman God had built for him.

One of the surprising things of this way of making the woman is that she was, in a way, born from a man. The other surprising thing is that she never had a mother. She had to invent what it was to be a woman, and became the mother of all women.

Another interesting aspect of both Adam and Chavvah (Eve)¹ is that neither of them likely had a navel, as neither of them were born from a womb, so they had no need for a placenta. This was perhaps a simple and effective way for them to prove to their descendants that they were both made directly by God.

But why would God create the woman in such an unusual way, as there is no indication that any other female creature was made in this way? I believe that it is Jehovah God’s way of showing us how He had made His own Son, Jesus Christ. Just as the woman came from the man, Jesus (Jeshua in Aramaic) came from His Father. Just as the woman was not an exact clone of the man, Jeshua was not an exact clone of his Father. -Which is another way of saying that both Chavvah and Jeshua are unique, individual beings. Just as the woman had no mother, Jeshua also had no mother. Just as the woman was human like the man, Jeshua was God like His Father. As the woman owed her existence to the man and Jehovah, so Jeshua owed his existence to His Father Jehovah. You can read more on this topic in our article *Jeshua the Messiah, the Son of God or Part of a Trinity?* at chcpublications.net.

But now, back to God’s Creation:

Gen 1:27 So God created man in His image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Gen 1:28 Then God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; rule over the fish of the sea, and over the flying creatures of the heaven, and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”

¹ The first woman’s name in Hebrew and Aramaic is חַוְוָה (*Chavvah*), which means *Life*. Life in Greek is *Eva*, from which *Eve* is derived. We will use her Hebrew name throughout.

So we see that God blessed the man and woman, told them to fill the earth, and also told them both that He had placed them in authority over all the creatures on earth. We were intended to subdue the earth, which indicates that we had permission to remove plants that were in our way, dig for minerals and modify the landscape to suit our needs. But it seems certain that our rule over the animals was to be beneficial for all animals as far as possible. They were not to be subdued like the earth. Jehovah God had just created them all and was very pleased with them. We were to rule them under God's direction and according to His Instructions, as God is King of kings and Lord of lords (1 Tim 6:15, Rev 17:14). This is made clear when God describes our food, and indeed that of all animals:

Gen 1:29 And God said, "See, I have given *to you* every plant that yields seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit yields seed; it shall be for food for you.

Gen 1:30 "Also, to every beast of the earth, to every flying creature of the heavens, and to everything that creeps on the earth, in which there is life, I have given every green plant for food." And it was so.

So it was that the first humans were vegans. Their food was entirely plant material. The only exception to this would be babies who would be breast-fed until they were old enough to flourish on a vegetable diet. No animals were intended to die to provide food or clothing for humans.

Not only the humans, but all of the animals were also vegan. It looks like the main difference between the humans and the animals was that only the humans had been given the fruit of the trees to eat. So we have the original system in place which does not require the death of any human or animal for food.

Jehovah God also instituted marriage then, and married Adam and Chavvah:

Gen 2:24 Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.

Gen 2:25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and they were not ashamed.

There are many things embedded in these two verses: One is that it would be normal for a newly married husband and wife to move out and set up their own home. Another is that through sexual intercourse they would become one flesh, indicating that their sexual union altered and enhanced their relationship to each other, and that oneness would be shown in their children, who would be a unique combination of their DNA. Finally, the last verse shows their innocence and purity at that time. They did not know what shame was.

Gen 1:31 Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning: The Sixth day.

Gen 2:1 Thus the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished.

So we see God's declaration that His creation was very good, that He had devoted one day to creating all the land animals and the first man and woman, and that it was the last of the six days He used to create everything, and it was now finished.

To both celebrate His Creation, and to remind everyone how long it took and that He had done it, Jehovah instituted the seven day week in which the last day was one of rest and rejoicing:

Gen 2:2 And by the seventh day God had completed His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done.

Gen 2:3 Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because He rested from all His work in it, which He had created and made.

God gave His seven day week to Adam and Chavvah, and thus to their descendants, many of whom adopted His seven day week and observed God's seventh day Sabbath. This is the only logical explanation for the wide-spread 'custom' of seven day weeks throughout the world. The seven day week has been used for millennia by the Jewish, Christian, Babylonian, Persian, Chinese and Islamic calendars. Seven days is not a precise subdivision of either the solar year or the lunar month.

What we have not discussed until now is why would God decide to create all of us? The Bible makes it clear that Jehovah God is complete in Himself and has no needs that we can fulfill for Him. This leaves one other option: Jehovah loves being alive, and wants to share His joy in life with us. His motivations are generosity and love.

Evolutionists insist that the above creation account cannot be correct, and have an alternative method and timeline for the origin of these creatures and ourselves. So, let us see how the Atheistic Evolution of complex life scenario explains our existence:

Evolution:

Let's ignore the fact that the last session showed that evolutionists cannot explain how the first living cell arose, and allow them to actually have their first living cell. How do we grow more complex organisms from a single cell according to Evolution?

Neo-Darwinism claims that complexity arises by random mutations to the DNA codes, which are then filtered by natural selection to remove the damaging mutations and allow the positive changes to be passed on.

Everyone agrees that a new feature, organ or organism can only happen if we have large amounts of new, complex and precisely coded DNA arise to specify what the new feature is, control how the new feature is manufactured and have new 'software' arise so the new feature can be used.

Neo-Darwinism also teaches that natural selection has no predictive power, which means that it has no goal that it is selecting for. Therefore, complex and highly sophisticated new tissues and functions must arise from random DNA 'noise' via a long series of tiny improvements, each of which must make that organism more fit than its siblings for the changes to be passed on to its descendants.

Do we see this happening in human activities? Computer code is a close corollary to DNA code. Does anyone generate vast amounts of random code and then select the 'best' one to create new functions? No. They first decide what new function they require. Then they carefully propose one or more models that should implement their pre-conceived function. Only then do they select the best model and begin to write the actual code required to do what they need. Finally, they rigorously test (select) the new code to find and remove any accidental errors (random mutations) in the code so it will be functional. They then review how well that optimised code performs its intended role, try to refine their models to further improve it and write new code again if needed. Restated, random code and random errors are both information technology disasters that they

actively work against. How is DNA code different?

We often hear that our technology is evolving. For example, wheeled land transport has evolved from a human pushed wheelbarrow to a self-driving Tesla electric car. As evolution claims, the engineers have achieved this transformation in thousands of tiny steps. But unlike evolution, each step was not one selection from thousands of random changes. Each step came from an engineer's mind, who conceived of a possible solution to one of the problems they were having, and then worked towards that solution, consciously and deliberately selecting the best alternatives to reach their intended goal. Without their idea and their goal, no progress would have ever been made.

Atheistic evolution has no ideas and no goals, just filtering of random mutations (errors). Does it seem probable that blind flailing can produce the complex nanomachinery, far more sophisticated than a Tesla car, required by living organisms? Instead, is it more likely to break the machinery it already has?

As we saw last session, Doug Axe's research has demonstrated that random mutations are incapable of producing coherent new code, so it is impossible for natural selection to select something that does not already exist. The best that natural selection can do is eliminate the more damaging mutations or perhaps fine-tune an existing organism so it can survive better in an altered environment. Natural selection is not even capable of removing most of the non-lethal but damaging random mutations.

Michael Behe's *Edge of Evolution* demonstrates this with real-world examples. Humanity's millennia long battle with malaria is sometimes called an arms-race. But now that we know the biochemical details of how we and malaria 'evolve' resistance to each other, the clearer it becomes that it is really a battle of desperate self-sacrificial sabotage. Our main internal defence against malaria is sickle cell trait, caused by a change in one amino acid in our hemoglobin. The defect causes the hemoglobin to gum together when a malarial parasite attacks it. Then our liver destroys the parasite when it destroys the infected blood cell. But when a person gets the trait from both parents, they develop sickle cell anaemia, which gives them a very unhealthy and short life. The defence has a horrendous cost.

Likewise, malaria can eventually resist our anti-malarial drugs by breaking functions in its own cells which allow it to eliminate the drug. But like us, it is at a cost which makes the malaria less fit in an environment without the drug's presence. Behe also looks at HIV and *E Coli*, and shows that the situation is about the same there. He shows that it takes a long time for random changes to make even a single 'beneficial' amino acid. And where two amino acid changes are required, it takes much, much longer. His maths indicate that just a three amino acid change is unlikely to ever occur, and can find no examples where it has actually happened. There is instance where a brilliant new multi-amino acid function has arisen which would give one organism or another a massive advantage.

For more complex life to evolve, we need more complex instructions in their DNA to code for that complexity. How hard is that to account for? Let's look at the size of some of the Evolutionary Jumps required for complex life:

Prokaryotic to Eukaryotic cells?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zZtcMBTQaS4> (4.5 min)

Massive changes are required. The genome of the smallest free-living eukaryote, *Ostreococcus tauri* (a unicellular green alga) is 12.6 million base pairs. This is over fourteen times more information than was in the *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* prokaryote's DNA. Where did all of this brand new, precisely coded DNA come from?

Vascular plants

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h9oDTMXM7M8> (12 min)

The vascular plant with perhaps the smallest genome at 130 million base pairs is *Capsella rubella*, a Brassicaceae. This is over one hundred and forty times more information than was in the *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* prokaryote's DNA and ten times more information than the basic eukaryote, *Ostreococcus tauri* has. Once again, where did all of this brand new, precisely coded DNA come from to build, use and maintain these new structures? How could any of these previously unknown vascular tissues arise by random mutations? What does some of this extra information do?

Seed production

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fYSxgVGtMmU> (3 min)

How did the male and female differentiation, and their resultant recombinations of DNA arise? How could any of this evolve, or more accurately co-evolve simultaneously? There are no detailed, or even plausible, evolutionary explanations for this in either plants or animals.

And for plants, how could this recombination of DNA then become encapsulated in the totally different set of plant structures that become a seed?

Seed Germination

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w77zPAtVTuI> (3 Min)

And now that encapsulated DNA, after being stored as a dry seed for perhaps years, is somehow reactivated and transformed back into a vascular plant like the one that produced the seed. This is indeed reproduction after its kind, but at a very complex level. It is as astounding as metamorphosis in insects. Again, evolutionary theory has no real explanation for how this could have arisen.

Fruit Production Why fleshy fruit? How does this really benefit the plant? Most plants do not produce fleshy fruit and are able to reproduce and spread their seed fine. The plant must invest a lot of energy into producing these fleshy fruits. It certainly benefits us, and fits with God's claim that He designed these plants to produce food for us.

Symbiotic plants/microbes

<https://academic.oup.com/pcp/article/51/9/1377/1829713> This article summarises some of the recent information discovered on these symbiotic relationships, especially the signalling systems acting between the plant and its various microbes. How would such complex interactions develop from random mutations?

And it is important to understand the nitrogen fixing nodules on legumes are only one type of

these symbiotic relationships. There are many types known now, and they do various things like help plants extract nutrients from poor soil and survive droughts.

Insects

Next on the evolutionist's ladder of life would likely be insects. As the article below states, the smallest known insect genome belongs to the wingless Antarctic midge and is 99 million base pairs long. This is over one hundred times more information than was in the *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* procaryote's DNA, but a bit less than the *Capsella rubella* Brassica. But that is no comfort to the evolutionist, as there are many, many unique genes separating the plant from this insect. Once again, enormous amounts of brand new, precisely coded DNA needed to come into existence to build, use and maintain these new structures.

<https://www.livescience.com/47311-antarctic-insect-smallest-genome.html>

Some of the unique new structures of the insects are:

Exoskeleton

Nerve systems

Chewing digestive systems

Legs

Wings

Metamorphosis: See

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ocWgSgMGxOc> (2.75 min)

How could evolution ever give rise to this process? Unless it is fully in place, no viable adult insect will ever appear.

Amphibians

These creatures mark another level of complexity above insects. This is again reflected in their DNA, with frogs having about 1.7 billion base pairs. This is about 1800 times more information than the *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* procaryote and 18 times more DNA than the Antarctic midge. The unique structures in these amphibians compared to insects include an internal bone skeleton, a complex nervous system partly encased in a skull and backbone, directional vertebrate eyes, fins, gills, lungs, a three chambered heart running a blood vessel network and skin. And frogs also undergo amazing transformations from eggs to gill-breathing finned-tail swimming vegetarian tadpoles to air-breathing four-legged hopping insect-eating frogs.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wAcwjWi6I9Y> (7 min) Again, there is no reasonable evolutionary explanation for why and how this metamorphosis could happen.

Haeckel's Fraudulent Embryo Drawings

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ecH5SKxL9wk> (4.1 min)

Sadly, this is only one of many, many deceptions used to 'prove evolution'. When an evolutionist has little real supporting data and few moral constraints, using deceptions can be attractive.

Cambrian Explosion

All major body plans appear at once and fully formed in a startlingly short time even by evolutionist's timescales.

<https://www.shapeoflife.org/video/cambrian-explosion> (13 min)

Complex eyes in trilobites, etc

More on this in Flood section.

Vestigial organs - virtually all gone. Though as school students we were taught that many organs in our bodies were useless leftovers from when we were less evolved creatures, today they have been discovered to be fully functional. This provides an example of the damage that evolutionary beliefs can do: When the function of such organs as our pituitary glands, tonsils and appendix were not known, evolutionary belief that they were useless delayed research on them for decades. Many tonsils and appendixes were removed unnecessarily, leaving the person more susceptible to infections.

Junk DNA - virtually all human DNA is used - no junk. In the 1980's, as the evolutionists learned how large the human genome is, and that less than five percent of it is directly used as genes to make proteins, they decided in their ignorance that the rest of it was just junk we had acquired over billions of years of evolution. They appeared to learn nothing from their earlier claims of vestigial organs. But now the ENCODE project has found that almost our entire genome is read and used.² Many of the stretches of DNA that were claimed to be useless remnants of ancient virus embedded in our DNA are now known to be critical to our development as embryos, etc. This lack of junk DNA makes evolution by random mutations even more impossible.

Genetic Entropy John Stanford, the inventor of the Gene Gun, wrote *Genetic Entropy* several years ago. His studies of the deterioration of DNA, and especially human DNA, caused by mutations and copying errors, indicate that we are becoming less healthy generation by generation as these errors continue to accumulate. He believes that this effect will make us less able to reproduce and perhaps eventually become extinct if there is no intervention. His calculations indicate that at our current rate of error accumulation, humans have only existed for about six to ten thousand years. This is also the reason why near relatives can no longer marry, as they tend to have the same genetic defects. It is also why evolution can never work.

Gene duplication and reuse: This process is commonly sited as a source of 'new' DNA which can be 'easily' converted into a new functional protein, etc. A large scale example of gene duplication is Down's Syndrome. In this case, the duplication results in life-long disability and usually an early death. In this case, one of our smallest chromosomes are duplicated. As larger chromosomes are duplicated, the disabilities become more pronounced. When the largest chromosomes are duplicated, the child will die before birth.

It is difficult to see how this duplication is a useful process for evolution, and there are no clear examples of this repurposing happening to a duplicated gene. It would take far, far more than two or three amino acid changes to produce a new function.

How complex is an organism like a human?

DNA in our genome is 3.2 billion base pairs long.³ This is about thirty-five thousand times the

² <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/junk-dna/junk-dna-and-encode-revisited/>

³ The only human computer code that comes close to this is Google's software, which is now about two billions bits long. This has taken many thousands of IT staff working for twenty years so far and

size of the *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* prokaryote's genome and almost double the size of the frog's. Once again, a tremendous amount of new, unique, precisely coded DNA is required to make, operate and repair a human being's body. In addition to common design features with frogs, we have live births of our children who require mothers milk and long nurturing periods. Frogs mostly just lay eggs and swim away. We can also walk upright and have complex spoken and written language, mathematics and extensive tool making and usage abilities.

As the damage done to us by random mutations makes clear, there is no way that random mutations could ever produce a functioning human being. The reality is that these mutations are highly damaging, which is why we have laws in place to protect us from mutagenic chemicals and ionising radiation, and we especially keep pregnant women away from them.

We have 80 different organs and more than 200 cell types in our bodies, each performing its own function(s) to support our overall health. (Read 1 Corinthians 12:12-25 for a brief account of the interactions needed in our bodies.)

There are about 37 trillion cells in each of us. What level of design would be required to grow such an organism from a single cell and ensure that each and every cell will be where it should be, be the type of cell required there and be able to do what it must do to ensure our survival? We are only beginning to understand how this all happens, let alone being able to even copy the process.

Our hands are unique, as they are designed specifically to use tools. They are not required for walking. No other organism has forelimbs as complex and precisely controlled as ours.

Apes to Humans? and other missing links -the real story and DNA similarity:

Similarity was first claimed to be about 97% based on a few fragments. Now that both organism's DNA are fully sequenced, similarity is now down to about 85%.⁴ Which means there are vast differences. 15% of our DNA means there are 480 million changes. - And these are only the changes that are supposedly retained and therefore beneficial. If we assume that humans diverged from apes 3 million years ago and the generation gap is 16 years, this means that there were at most 187,500 generations. So we would have to inherit 2,560 beneficial, directed DNA changes **every** generation. Not only that, but those changes would all need to be conserved each generation, and eventually all wind up in one man and one woman, who would then become the ancestors of every human alive today.

Even the most optimistic geneticists doubt that we could get more than 2 or 3 beneficial changes per generation, and even that would require a huge population. Actual research shows that it can take hundreds of generations to achieve even one beneficial change. There is no conceivable way that this much genetic information could be generated and passed on in this timeframe, nor even in many hundreds or thousands of millions of years. The only possible conclusion is that we could not have evolved from an apelike creature.

it is still being debugged, refined and expanded. Much of it is just simple word-matching and website-ranking options, both far less complex than our DNA code.

4

https://assets.answersingenesis.org/doc/articles/pdf-versions/arj/v9/101_chimpanzee_human_dna.pdf

Animal and Human Complexity

Meiosis - why would evolution 'decide' to make reproductive cells with only one copy of the normal cell's two DNA copies?

Animal conception is complex and different to plants. Usually involves intercourse.

sperm and egg, not pollen and ova

Testes and sperm -full of mitochondria so they can swim fast.

Zinc "spark"- marks fertilisation of egg. May also mark when the spirit is given?

Ovaries - contain hundreds of thousands of eggs - useful for a woman initially designed to live thousands of years.

Uterus

Placenta - How would a partly evolved placenta keep a fetus alive?

Change-over to air breathing at birth even requires a rapid change in baby's hemoglobin.

Mammaries needed to feed infant. How did the infant survive while breasts evolved?

Colostrum and suckling instinct. Where did they come from?

Hearts and blood systems

precise, multi-step blood clotting system required

hemophiliac bleeds vs strokes due to blood clots

worms- have no real lungs -limits size

Digestive system -human:

Chewing- complex activity

Teeth -baby and adult (mammoths grow three sets of teeth)

Saliva

Stomach

shape - solids retained, liquids pass through

HCl - converts protein to amino acids

Small Intestine

villa and microvilla enhance absorption

Large intestine

symbiotic biota in gut -part of the immune system

Rectum

twin valve system - gas or solid on the way?

Kidneys and bladder

Eyes

Eyelid and lash to protect eye

Cornea - lubricated, transparent, but living cells

lens - focusable

Iris - to control light levels

Back of eye

Macular-for fine work

Blind spot and muscle/nerve systems

Massive image processing requirements

So-called 'Backwards' design?

Needed for blood vessel Cooling system

Uses Fibre optics to pass light through to retina

Nervous systems

Origin of backbones?

Origin of brains?

Complexity of human brain

Role of brain -Body-soul-spirit interface -a difficult job.

The above is just a few items in an extremely long list that are so complex random mutations are incapable of creating them...

Though I can be accused of saying ‘God did it!’, one needs to be just as cautious when an evolutionist claims ‘Evolution did it!’. Of course, they will be very careful to avoid that precise phrase, but look carefully and you will see that is exactly what they are saying. Almost all scientific papers that claim that something ‘evolved’ make absolutely no attempt to explain how it evolved. Which is just the same as saying “Evolution did it! And those few that do make some attempt to show how it evolved are always very vague and make many highly questionable assumptions. Why do they do that? Because they have no actual evidence that evolution has ever evolved even one complex organ or organism.

Here is an example from Charles Darwin:

To suppose that the [human] eye could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree....[But] Reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a simple and imperfect eye to one complex and perfect can be shown to exist, each grade being useful to its possessor, as is certainly the case; if further, the eye ever varies and the variations be inherited, as is likewise certainly the case; and if such variations should be useful to any animal under changing conditions of life, then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, though insuperable by our imagination, should not be considered as subversive of the theory.”⁵

Indeed there are different light sensing systems in different animals, each suited to that animal’s requirements. And it is possible to make a long list of these animals from the simplest to the most complex eye. But what evidence is there that the DNA instructions required to form and use one type of eye evolved into the next more complex one even once, let alone again and again? There is absolutely none. Like Darwin, modern evolutionists blindly choose to believe that it happened, however absurd it is. That is to say: “Evolution did it!”

In contrast to destructive random mutations, Jehovah God has the creative ability to both design and make new organs and organisms.

Next Session:

Paradise Lost: The Fall. How we went from joyfully living forever in the Paradise of Pleasure with God to isolation, hard slog, sickness and death.

*Written by Bruce Armstrong
M App Sci*

*Published by
CENTRAL HIGHLANDS CHRISTIAN PUBLICATIONS
PO Box 236, Creswick, Vic 3363 Australia
Email info@chcpublications.net*

⁵ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, pg 228

Web Page <http://www.chcpublications.net>

Copyright © 2018

Permission is given to copy and distribute this document provided it is not altered and copied in full. Copies must be given away. We ask only that you notify us if you are making numerous copies.

Scripture quotes are from our CHCG translation.